



Obama Defends Hillary While Promising No Politics in Investigation

Appearing on *Fox News Sunday*, President Obama told host Chris Wallace that the investigation into Hillary Clinton's use of a private e-mail server is being conducted without "political influence." But he also said that he stands behind previous statements that he and White House Press Secretary Josh Earnest have made that Clinton "has not jeopardized America's national security."

In [his first appearance](#) on *Fox News Sunday* since becoming president, Obama faced a wide range of questions dealing with everything from Senate confirmation of his choice of Garland for the Supreme Court, to the threat of terrorism, to the economy, to former Secretary of State Clinton's use of a private, unsecured e-mail server. And while the president gave some audacious answers to many of the questions on all of those topics, none were as shocking as his claims that "Hillary Clinton ... would never intentionally put America in any kind of jeopardy" and that, in fact, "she has not jeopardized America's national security."



As shocking as those statement would be on their own, they are even more so considering that they were not made in a vacuum; they were President Obama's immediate answer to Wallace asking:

Last October, you said that Hillary Clinton's private e-mail server did not jeopardize national secrets. Since then, we've learned that over 2,000 of her e-mails contained classified material, 22 of the e-mails had top-secret information. Can you still say flatly that she did not jeopardize America's secrets?

When Wallace asked the question, he showed a video clip from October where the president said, "I can tell that you this is not a situation in which America's national security was endangered." Obama prefaced his answer by saying, "I've got to be careful because, as you know, there have been investigations. There are hearings. Congress is looking at this. And I haven't been sorting through each and every aspect of this." He then said, "Here's what I know: Hillary Clinton was an outstanding secretary of state. She would never intentionally put America in any kind of jeopardy."

The president went on to parrot the [oft-repeated claim](#) of Clinton's campaign that this is all a matter of "over-classification run amok," saying:



Written by [C. Mitchell Shaw](#) on April 12, 2016

And what I also know, because I handle a lot of classified information, is that there are — there's classified, and then there's classified. There's stuff that is really "top secret" top secret, and then there's stuff that is being presented to the president or the secretary of state, that you might not want on the transom, or going out over the wire, but is basically stuff that you could get in open source.

Wallace followed up by asking whether Obama is still willing to say — in light of the [2,079 classified e-mails](#) that were discovered on Clinton's private server — that she did not jeopardize national security. "But last October, you were prepared to say, 'She hasn't jeopardized,'" Wallace said, and then asked, "And the question is, can you still say that?"

President Obama answered by saying:

I continue to believe that she has not jeopardized America's national security. Now what I've also said is that — and she has acknowledged — that there's a carelessness, in terms of managing e-mails, that she has owned, and she recognizes.

Oh. Well as long as she "has acknowledged," "has owned," and "recognizes" her "carelessness," then it appears the president — who only seconds before these questions had said that fighting the threat of terrorism "is my number one job" — feels he can still say that "she has not jeopardized America's national security." In fact, Obama went on to say that is a matter of "perspective."

But I also think it is important to keep this in perspective. This is somebody who has served her country for four years as secretary of state, and did an outstanding job. And no one has suggested that in some ways, as a consequence of how she's handled e-mails, that that detracted from her excellent ability to carry out her duties.

It would be one thing for the president to say, "I haven't been sorting through each and every aspect of this." It is another thing altogether for him to expect both Wallace and the American people to swallow the fabrication that "no one has suggested that in some ways, as a consequence of how she's handled e-mails, that that detracted from her excellent ability to carry out her duties." That presupposes a level of ignorance that would be truly remiss.

For almost a year now, Hillary Clinton has had to answer (or more accurately, *dodge*) questions about how her use of the private, unsecured server "detracted" from her "ability to carry out her duties" as secretary of state. *The New American* has reported [over](#) and [over](#) again on the ways her mishandling of state secrets on her private server has jeopardized national security. Since national security is a priority of the office she held, it is beyond the pale to assert that she could have had 2,079 classified e-mails — some so sensitive that even redacted versions could not be released — and yet have been an "outstanding" and "excellent" secretary of state who "has not jeopardized America's national security." But the president did not even stop there; he then claimed that "no one has suggested that in some ways, as a consequence of how she's handled e-mails, that that detracted from her excellent ability to carry out her duties."

Given the president's defense of Clinton's actions and his glowing endorsement of her service as secretary of state, it naturally follows that the investigation into Clinton's actions has — and will continue to have — a political element driving it. Wallace used this moment to ask the president whether decisions in the case "will be made on political grounds, not legal grounds."

Mr. President, when you say what you've just said, when Josh Earnest said, as he did — your spokesman — in January, the information from the Justice Department is she's not a target, some



Written by [C. Mitchell Shaw](#) on April 12, 2016

people I think are worried whether or not — the decision whether or not, how to handle the case, will be made on political grounds, not legal grounds.

Can you guarantee to the American people, can you direct the Justice Department to say, “Hillary Clinton will be treated — as the evidence goes, she will not be in any way protected.”

Obama assured his host that politics would play no part in this — or any other — case. “I guarantee it. I guarantee that there is no political influence in any investigation conducted by the Justice Department or the FBI,” he said, adding’ “not just in this case, but in any case.”

Had the president not just spent more than two full minutes defending the indefensible, denying the undeniable, and excusing the inexcusable where Clinton’s use of an unauthorized, private, unsecured e-mail server was concerned, it *may* have been possible to take him at his word. As it is, though, such belief stretches the boundaries of reason. After all, is there anything more political than a sitting president publicly defending, denying, and excusing the illegal behavior of a member of his own party who was also his appointee to the job she failed so miserably to do?

But in spite of all the political maneuvering, indications are that Clinton may face [indictment](#) for her actions. That [indictment](#) could [come](#) at [any time now](#). Whether Obama’s political maneuvering is an attempt at damage control or an attempt to send a message to investigators and prosecutors is hard to say.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.

Subscribe